

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Claims 1-36 were originally submitted.

Claim 1-17, 25, and 27-36 are canceled without prejudice.

Claims 18, 22, 23, 24, and 26 have been previously amended.

Claims 18-24 and 26 remain in this application.

35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 18-19 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,748,217 B1 to Hunzinger et al (Hunzinger). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Hunzinger teaches a mobile unit in a wireless communication system, where service selection is enhanced by a determination of geographic location of the mobile unit, and a service system is selected based on the position of the mobile unit. (See Hunzinger, col. 1 line 66 to col. 2 line 2). Hunzinger also teaches a method of mapping a service system for wireless communication system which establishing a reference location and determining service availability for the reference location. Information on service availability of the reference location is then stored. Data is collected on service information for a plurality of reference locations and the data is combined to provide a map of a service area showing service availability. The combined data may be converted into a formula defining a service area. (See Hunzinger, col. 2 line 61 to col. 3 line 4).

1 **Independent claim 26** recites in part “a GPS module configured to receive
2 RF signals from GPS satellites through the antenna module and analog to digital
3 converter indicating location of the wireless communication device; wherein the
4 instructions are further comprised of a map that indicates to a user relative location
5 of the wireless communication device”.

6 The Action argues that the element “a GPS module configured to receive
7 RF signals form GPS satellites through the antenna module and analog to digital
8 converter indicating location of the wireless communication device” is taught by
9 Hunzinger, the Action citing col. 1 lines 66 to col. 2, lines 1-4; col. 2, lines 39-44
10 of Hunzinger. Hunzinger describes the use of a global positioning system to
11 determine the position of the mobile station; however, there is no disclosure in
12 Hunzinger as to a GPS module that is part of mobile station as particularly recited
13 by claim 26. The global positioning system described in Hunzinger may be an
14 external system to the mobile station. In other words, Hunzinger does not
15 specifically teach or show a GPS module to receive RF signal from GPS satellites,
16 where the GPS module is part of the mobile station, to determine the mobile
17 station’s location, as particularly recited in claim 26.

18 The Action argues that the element “wherein the instructions are further
19 comprised of a map that indicates to a user relative location of the wireless
20 communication device” is taught by Hunzinger, the Action citing the Abstract,
21 lines 14-17; col.2, lines 10-15, 47-56; col. 4, lines 17-27 of Hunzinger. The
22 mapping described in Hunzinger is directed to selecting or estimating available
23 service. In particular, as discussed above, the mapping based on gathered data is
24 used to create a map of available services. However, there is no disclosure in
25 Hunzinger as to the map or mapping being used to indicate to the user the relative

1 location of the wireless communication device (mobile station) as recited in claim
2 26.

3 Accordingly, Hunzinger fails to teach every element of claim 26, and the
4 rejection of claim 26 is therefore improper. Applicant respectfully requests that
5 the §102 rejection of claim 26 be withdrawn.

6 **Dependent claims 18 and 19** depend from and comprise all the elements of
7 claim 26. As such, dependent claims 18 and 19 are allowable at least by virtue of
8 their dependency on base claim 26. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102
9 rejection of claims 18 and 19 be withdrawn. These claims are also allowable for
10 their own recited features, which are not disclosed, taught or suggested by the
11 references of record.

12 Claim 18, for example, further recites “wherein the instructions are further
13 comprised to send call forwarding instructions to service providers based on
14 conditions set by the user”. The Action argues that this element is taught by
15 Hunzinger, citing col. 5, lines 11-20, and stating that “calls from/to the mobile
16 station are routed through the most desirable system looking a system selection
17 database that include user zone priority”. Although Hunzinger discloses selecting
18 a service system, there is no teaching by Hunzinger as to “call forwarding
19 instructions” or sending call forwarding instructions as particularly recited by
20 claim 18.

21 Claim 19 depends on claim 18, and further recites “wherein the call
22 forwarding instructions are to forward calls to a particular carrier network”. The
23 Action argues that this element is taught by Hunzinger, citing col. 1, lines 66 to
24 col. 2, lines 1-10, and stating “the calls are routed to the selected network based on
25 the position of the mobile station with respect to the service system”. Hunzinger,

1 and the particular cited section of Hunzinger, discloses that based on the location
2 of the mobile station, a service system is selected. There is no disclosure in
3 Hunzinger as to call forwarding instructions to forward calls to a particular carrier
4 network as recited in claim 19.

5
6 **35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

7 Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
8 over Hunzinger in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,546,246 B1 to Bridges et al
9 (Bridges). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

10 **Dependent claims 22 and 23** depend from and comprise all the elements of
11 claim 26. In particular, claims 22 and 23 comprise the element “a GPS module
12 configured to receive RF signals from GPS satellites through the antenna module
13 and analog to digital converter indicating location of the wireless communication
14 device; wherein the instructions are further comprised of a map that indicates to a
15 user relative location of the wireless communication device”. As discussed above
16 in support of claim 26, Hunzinger fails to teach or suggest this element. Therefore,
17 the rejection of claims 22 and 23 should be withdrawn.

18 Additionally, the Action admits that Hunzinger fails to teach “wherein the
19 instructions are further comprised to store service set identifier numbers of
20 wireless area networks accessible by the user and the wireless communication
21 device”. The Action relies on Bridges as teaching this element. Bridges, however,
22 provides no assistance in light of Hunzinger as to the recited wireless
23 communication device of claim 26 from which claims 22 and 23 depend.
24 Accordingly, a combination of Hunzinger and Bridges fails to teach or suggest
25 every element of claims 22 and 23, and the rejection of claims 22 and 23 is

1 therefore improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of
2 claims 22 and 23 be withdrawn.

3 Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
4 Hunzinger in view of Bridges, in further view of well known prior art. Applicant
5 respectfully traverses the rejection.

6 **Dependent claim 24** depends from and comprises all the elements of claim
7 26. In particular, claim 24 comprises the element “a GPS module configured to
8 receive RF signals from GPS satellites through the antenna module and analog to
9 digital converter indicating location of the wireless communication device;
10 wherein the instructions are further comprised of a map that indicates to a user
11 relative location of the wireless communication device”. As discussed above in
12 support of claim 26, Hunzinger fails to teach this element. The rejection of claim
13 24 should be withdrawn.

14 The Action admits that Hunzinger fails to teach “wherein the instructions
15 are further comprised to store service set identifier numbers of wireless area
16 networks accessible by the user and the wireless communication device”. The
17 Action relies on Bridges as teaching this element. Bridges, however, provides no
18 assistance in light of Hunzinger as to the recited wireless communication device of
19 claim 26 from which claim 24 depend.

20 The Action relies on Examiner’s Official Notice “that is notoriously well
21 known to store access information of cellular networks in a wireless
22 communication device because this information makes possible the connection of
23 the wireless communication device to a network in order to obtain service”.
24 Applicant argues otherwise, and traverses the Examiner’s Official Notice. As
25 provided by 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2), if the Examiner is relying on personal knowledge

1 to support the finding of what is well know in the art, the Examiner must provide
2 an affidavit or declaration setting forth specific factual statements and explanation
3 to support the finding.

4 Accordingly, a combination of Hunzinger, Bridges, and Official Notice fails
5 to teach or suggest every element of claim 24, and the rejection of claim 24 is
6 therefore improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of
7 claim 24 be withdrawn.

8 Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
9 over Hunzinger in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,591,103 B1 to Dunn et al (Dunn).
10 Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

11 **Dependent claims 20 and 21** depend from and comprise all the elements of
12 claims 26 and 18. In particular, claim 26 comprises the element “a GPS module
13 configured to receive RF signals from GPS satellites through the antenna module
14 and analog to digital converter indicating location of the wireless communication
15 device; wherein the instructions are further comprised of a map that indicates to a
16 user relative location of the wireless communication device”. Furthermore, claim
17 18 further comprises the element “wherein the instructions are further comprised
18 to send call forwarding instructions to service providers based on conditions set by
19 the user”.

20 As discussed above in support of claim 18, Hunzinger fails to teach these
21 elements. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 22 and 23 should be withdrawn.

22 The Action argues that “Dunn discloses a wireless telecommunication
23 system in which it is determined which networks and base stations are potential
24 carrier for a call in base of the location and preferences of a user device, for
25 example costs to operate (Abstract, lines 8-17; col.7, lines 12-23, 55-56; col.7,

1 lines 59-65)". Dunn teaches connecting a user (i.e., mobile device) to a base
2 stations; however, there is not teaching or suggestion in Dunn as to as to call
3 forwarding instructions based on conditions set by a user, wherein the conditions
4 are based on lowest cost to operate as recited in claim 20, or wherein the
5 conditions are based on quality of service as recited in claim 21.

6 Accordingly, a combination of Hunzinger and Dunn fails to teach or
7 suggest every element of claims 20 and 21 and the rejection of claims 20 and 21 is
8 therefore improper. Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of
9 claims 20 and 21 be withdrawn.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5

8

9

0

1

2